



Type: Magazine Article

The Book of Abraham

Author(s): J. M. Sjodahl

Source: *Improvement Era*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (February 1913)

Published by: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Page(s): 326-333

Abstract: This article refutes claims made by Rev. F. S. Spalding that the Book of Mormon was not an authentic book because the Book of Abraham was translated incorrectly and that surely means that Joseph Smith was not a translator. Sjodahl points out that the Book of Mormon was translated by the gift and power of God, whereas the book of Abraham required seven years of laborious study coupled with inspiration. One cannot be judged on the merits of the other.

The Book of Abraham.

BY J. M. SJODAHL, EDITOR OF THE "DESERET NEWS"

[On December 17, the following article appeared as an editorial in the *Deseret News*. The ERA has permission from the author, Elder J. M. Sjodahl, to reproduce it in this series.—THE EDITORS.]

We are indebted to the Right Rev. Bishop F. S. Spalding for a copy of his pamphlet on "Joseph Smith, Jr., as a Translator."

In this pamphlet the author quotes eminent scholars in proof of the assertion that the Prophet's translation of certain Egyptian documents accompanying the "Book of Abraham" is wrong. And he argues that if the Prophet failed in one instance, he failed in another, and his translation of the Book of Mormon must also be rejected.

The scholars quoted are: Dr. A. H. Sayce, Oxford, England; Dr. W. H. Flinders Petrie, London University; Dr. James H. Breasted, Haskell Oriental Museum, Chicago; Dr. Arthur C. Mace, assistant Curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Dr. John Peters, University of Pennsylvania; Prof. C. A. B. Mercer, Western Theological Seminary; Dr. Edward Meyer, University of Berlin, and Dr. Friedrich Freiherr von Bissing, University of Munich.

This is, of course, a formidable array of scholarship, but not half as formidable as that which could be quoted against the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch, for instance. Bishop Spalding is well aware of the truth of this proposition. In fact, the Rev. gentleman is, we believe, somewhat infatuated with the scholarship which has produced a criticism known, since the days of Eichhorn, as "higher," though "negative" would describe its character more accurately. If he would state, freely and frankly, his views on certain portions of the Bible, they would be found not to differ essentially from those expressed on the correctness of the translation of the Book of Abra-

ham. His effort to break down faith in the Book of Mormon by directing against it the heavy batteries of Egyptian scholarship, is, therefore, not surprising. But it will prove in vain.

UNFAIR REASONING.

Before taking up the "scholarship" argument, we may state that the reasoning of the Bishop concerning the translation of the Book of Mormon and the Book of Abraham is hardly fair. The Book of Mormon was translated by inspiration, by means of "Urim and Thummim, the same instrument which enabled ancient men of God to render an infallible judgment and give to the people the mind and will of God. The Prophet Joseph, at the time he was called to render those ancient records into English, was an unlearned youth and the book itself was written in a language beyond the reach of the scholarship of our day. Its contents had to be revealed by the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the mind of the Prophet, or remain unknown. It was different with the Book of Abraham. That record came into his hands by purchase, as any other ancient document might have been procured. When it first attracted his attention he knew very little about its importance, but with the aid of W. W. Phelps and Oliver Cowdery he began to decipher some of the hieroglyphics, and as this work proceeded, he found to his joy that he had before him a literary production traceable to Abraham. Then he took up the study of the letters and the grammar of the Egyptian language. In this research he found himself, virtually, on pioneer ground, but, like Champollion, he had an almost intuitive linguistic sense. The work, however, pro-

ceeded slowly. It was begun in 1835. Not till seven years later, in 1842, could he begin the publication. (See "History of the Church" by Brigham H. Roberts, page 519, Vol. 4.) And it was never completed.

Here, then, is a difference between the two translations. The meaning of the characters on the Book of Mormon plates was given to him miraculously, by the direct operation of the Spirit of God upon his mind made receptive through prayer, visions, and meditation. The correct understanding of the Book of Abraham was given, also by the power of the Spirit of God but through the usual channels of research and as a reward for faithful investigation and labor. That the Prophet prayed earnestly for light and knowledge during the time he was occupied upon the translation, we need not say; for, like all the mighty men of God, he was a man of prayer and supplication; that the Lord answered his prayer, there can be no doubt. Both translations are, therefore, given by inspiration, but they came through different channels. That is the reason why the Bishop's argument is not fair. If a mistake should be proved in the translation of the Egyptian documents, that would not in any way affect the translation of the Book of Mormon. For such a mistake might be due to the channel through which the inspiration flowed, without lessening the value of the Book itself. There can be no such mistake in the Book of Mormon which came without the aid of scientific channels.

THE SCHOLARSHIP ARGUMENT.

Bishop Spalding's chief argument is this: Because there is a difference of opinion between certain eminent scholars and the Prophet Joseph concerning the meaning of the hieroglyphics the Prophet translated, therefore he is wrong and the scholars are right. This is the most extraordinary attempt at logic ever put forth by a scholar. The conclusion rests upon the monstrous assumption that there is an infallible, unchangeable scholarship, incapable of receiving more light, and to contradict which is heresy. We know better, and

the Rev. gentleman knows better. He knows that scholars sometimes are wrong, and that they are compelled by facts to abandon old theories for new ones. In the case of a difference of opinion, how does he know which side is certainly right? How does he know that the Prophet is not right, and that those on the other side are not wrong? Mathematics is an exact science, and its propositions may be demonstrated, but not so archeology.

SCHOLARS SOMETIMES ARE WRONG

Need we illustrate the fact that scholars sometimes are wrong?

It is still within the memory of man that Heinrich Schliemann was branded, by some pretty good scholars, as a dreamer, if not an impostor, when he first announced his startling discoveries. And yet, today, it is generally acknowledged that, as a result of his archeological researches, new light has been thrown on the ancient Greek civilization.

August le Plongeon, who devoted years to researches in Yucatan, was in his day regarded as little better than a charlatan, and some of his labors were necessarily expended on a defense of his claim to a hearing in the scientific world. Either he was wrong, or his critics were wrong. In either case the fact remains that scholars sometimes are wrong.

But hear Dr. M. G. Kyle, an eminent Egyptologist:

"In 1904 one of the foremost archeologists of Europe said to me: 'I do not believe there ever were such people as the Hittites and I do not believe 'Kheta' in the Egyptian inscriptions was meant for the name 'Hittites.' We will allow that archeologist to be nameless now, but the ruins of Troy vindicated the right of her people to a place in real history and the ruins of Boghatz-koi bid fair to afford a more striking vindication of the Bible representation of the Hittites."

We appreciate the courtesy of Dr. Kyle in not mentioning the name of the prominent European archeologist who manifested his ignorance by his skepticism. For ought we know, it might

have been one of the European scientists quoted by Bishop Spalding. But whoever he was, he was as mistaken as he was positive. For, through the researches of Winckler, and others, an entire Hittite empire has been recovered from the debris of the past. It was an empire in Asia Minor, extending in every direction, and it was important enough to enter into treaties with Babylonia on one side and Egypt on the other.

The Hittites occupy a prominent part in the Bible. In Joshua the country between Lebanon and the Euphrates is called the Land of the Hittites. Solomon imported horses from the king of the Hittites, and the Syrians, when making war upon Israel on one occasion, feared that they would have to fight the Hittites, too. And yet an eminent scholar, a very few years ago denied that they ever existed. Bible students were necessarily forced to take issue with such scholars on this question, without having the proofs at their command, until further light came. It has now been proved that Thotmes III., of Egypt, marched to the banks of the Euphrates and received tribute from the "greater Hittites" to the amount of 3,200 pounds of silver. It is known also that Rameses the Great was unsuccessful in his attempt to capture the Hittite stronghold Kadesh, and that he came near perishing. Four years later a Hittite princess became the wife of Rameses. Scholarship had a great deal to learn on the Hittites, and who shall say that it has nothing to learn on the subject treated on in the Book of Abraham?

Another illustration: Until this time scholarship has confidently maintained that the religion of Palestine came from Babylonia. Another view has recently been announced by Albert T. Clay, an authority on cuneiform inscriptions. He says "that the Semitic-Babylonian religion is an importation from Syria and Palestine (Amurru), that the creation, deluge, ante-diluvian patriarchs, etc., of Babylonia, came from Amurru, instead of the Hebraic stories having come from Babylonia,

as held by nearly all Semitic scholars." Here is a possible change announced in the conceptions of scholarship, which promises a complete scientific revolution.

There is no infallibility in scholarship. To assume that the Prophet was wrong simply because scholars say so is to beg the question.

DISCREPANCIES IN THE TESTIMONY OF SCHOLARS.

We have no prejudice against scholarship. Scholars are witnesses, and their testimony on any question is of as much value as "expert" testimony always is, provided it is unprejudiced and based on facts. But as to that the jury, in this case the public, must be the judge. Scholarship certainly has a right to a respectful hearing but it happens that the authorities quoted by Bishop Spalding disagree on some essential points, in their translations. In fact, they contradict each other, and their testimony is, consequently, of less value than it would have been otherwise.

Dr. Sayce maintains that the hieroglyphs are so ignorantly copied that hardly one of them is correct, but in the pictographs in the third illustration he recognizes a representation of the Goddess Maat leading "the pharaoh" before Osiris, behind whom stands the Goddess Isis.

Dr. Petrie almost agrees with Dr. Sayce. He also regards the third illustration as a representation of a judgment scene. Figure 1, he says, is Osiris in the usual form; figure 2 is Isis behind him; figure 3 is the stand of offerings with lotus flowers; figure 4 is the Goddess Nebhat, or Maat; he is not sure which; figure 5 is the dead person, and figure 6 is the God Anubis, the conductor of the souls of the dead. Where Dr. Sayce sees the Goddess Maat (Ma't?) Dr. Petrie is not certain of the name, because of the bad drawing, and where Dr. Sayce recognizes the spirit of "the pharaoh," Dr. Petrie sees only a dead person—any dead person. Attention is called to this by the very wording of Dr. Sayce's translation, for he employs the definite article, indi-

cating that a well known pharaoh—"the pharaoh"—is here portrayed. But which of them?

Dr. Breasted agrees with Dr. Sayce and Dr. Petrie that the figure on the throne represents Osiris. But who is the figure behind him? Probably Isis, he says. He is not as positive as the two other authorities. Figure 5, he says, is "a man" (not the pharaoh) being led before Osiris. The figure which Dr. Sayce calls Maat, and Dr. Petrie either Nebhat or Maat, Dr. Breasted calls the Goddess Truth, (Ma't), but the figure which Dr. Petrie is sure is Anubis, Dr. Breasted leaves without a name. It is but fair to state that the discrepancies in the explanations of this illustration are not material.

On the first illustration, however, the divergence is serious. Dr. Sayce wisely ignores this illustration entirely, but Dr. Petrie offers the following explanations: Figure 1 is the hawk of Horus; figure 2 is a dead person; figure 3 is Anubis; figure 4 is the usual funeral couch; figures 5, 6, 7, and 8 are the regular jars for embalming parts of the body; figure 10 are the funeral offerings. His view is that the picture represents an embalming scene, but he ignores figures 9, 11, and 12, entirely. Do they not fit into the embalming theory?

Dr. Breasted differs with Dr. Petrie. He considers that the reclining figure represents Osiris rising from the dead, although there is no resemblance between the Osiris of this illustration and that of the third. The figure which Dr. Petrie tells us represents the hawk of Horus, Dr. Breasted says is the Goddess Isis—quite a different Isis from that in the third illustration. And the figure which Dr. Petrie feels sure is Anubis, Dr. Breasted says is an officiating priest. Both these interpretations cannot be correct. Either Dr. Petrie or Dr. Breasted, is wrong.

Dr. John Peters also offers a suggestion, or two, on the proper interpretation of the first illustration. He regards the figure which Dr. Petrie says is the hawk of Horus, and

Dr. Breasted calls Isis, as the soul of the departed Egyptian (Kos). Three different theories on one figure! In figure 9, which Dr. Breasted ignores, he sees a crocodile ready to devour the dead if he is not properly embalmed, which naturally suggests the question whether the Egyptians believed that crocodiles fed on the souls of the dead.

We cannot within the necessarily restricted limits of this article pay attention to every detail of the learned testimony submitted, but it would not be proper to slight the opinion of Dr. Frederick Freiherr von Bissing, that the figure which Dr. Petrie calls Anubis is merely the "shadow" of the dead man. Will not Dr. Friedrich Freiherr von Bissing kindly explain how the shadow comes to wear a white apron?

On the second illustration there is practical unanimity. All the scholars quoted say it is a disc with magic inscriptions intended as a protection for the dead on the other side. But none of them offers an interpretation of the inscription. This is all the more remarkable because they all agree that the object is very familiar to Egyptian scholars.

A QUESTION OF WORDS.

Dr. Sayce ventures the assertion that the word "kolob," used by the Prophet Joseph, is not Egyptian. How does he know? Does he know every word in the entire Egyptian literature? It is certainly a Semitic word. By referring to an Arabic dictionary we find that it is still used in the Arabian language. As a verb it means "to turn," and a derivative might very properly be used as a noun to denote the center around which something turns, as it is used in the illustration in the Book of Abraham. The Arabian verb "qalaba" has many derivatives. We find it in the term "inqilab ashshams" which means "solstice," and in "qalb ulaqrab," which is the name for the star Alpha in the constellation Scorpio. This is proof enough that the word is used in the Semitic group of languages as an astronomical term, whether it is Egyptian or not, and it is not improbable

that Abraham, a Semite, should so use it.

Dr. Mercer remarks that the prophet's transliteration of the Hebrew word for "expanse" is "far from correct," but as he neglects to give us the transliteration which he considers correct, we cannot judge of the excellency of his spelling'. We note, however, that the art of writing Hebrew words in English has not yet received fixed rules. It is like phonetic spelling. Each writer has his own conception of it. A common transliteration of the word referred to is "raw-kee'ah," but whether that is so much better than "raukeepang" we leave to any Hebrew scholar to say.

In this connection it may be of interest to Dr. Mercer to have his attention called to the fact that most of the names we have from the Hebrew are very imperfect representations of the Hebrew letters. In the Hebrew there are no such names as "Moses," "Eve," "Solomon," "Samson," "Jephthah," "Saul," etc. The corresponding Hebrew names are, "Mosheh," "Chavah," "Shelomeh," "Shimeshon," "Iepathach," and "Shaaul," as near as we can write these names in English. There are innumerable illustrations of this discrepancy between the Hebrew and the accepted names. We have them from the Greek, mostly, and they have suffered in the double transliteration.

Dr. Mercer also suggests that "Jah-oh-eh" is a faulty transliteration of the Hebrew "Jehovah." Here again we must confess disappointment at the neglect of the learned doctor to tell the world how that Hebrew word ought to be transliterated in order to give the correct pronunciation. If he knows, he knows more than any other living scholar, Jew or Gentile, "Mormon" or non-"Mormon," and he should not keep the secret to himself. And since he questions the statement that the word is Egyptian, he should enlighten the world on the origin and meaning of it.

But some scholars are of the opinion that the word is akin to the Egyptian "A-Au," which they translate, "me-am." Willis Brewer, in "Egypt and Is-

rael," takes this view and writes it "Jehoah," a form not essentially different from that of the Prophet. (Compare "Jeh-o-ah," and "Jah-ch-eh.")

Modern scholarship generally, as Dr. Mercer, of course, knows, does not, however, write the word 'Jehovah,' but "Yahweh," and, in view of all the facts, it seems to us that the criticism of the learned doctor is, both small-souled and careless.

THE EXPLANATIONS GIVEN BY THE PROPHET.

When scholars tell us that the illustrations under consideration are scenes from the Book of the Dead, representing a judgment scene before the throne of Osiris, or that they contain instructions to the dead relative to another life, they believe that they have completely proved that the Prophet's explanations are false. But that does not follow.

There is practical unanimity that the third illustration represents a judgment scene before Osiris, although the testimony, as we have seen, differs in some details. But this does not contradict the explanation offered by the Prophet Joseph. The Egyptians had many festivals and their religion was rich in mythology. It was customary to give dramatic representations of their legends, in which the priests played the part of the gods. With this fact in mind we can easily understand that a judgment scene may here be represented with Abraham, Pharaoh, and the prince as the main actors, and two servants taking inferior parts. In such a representation Abraham would naturally take occasion to tell the audience something about the structure of the universe. The Prophet, in fact, intimates that this is a judgment scene, for he says that figure 1 is Abraham sitting upon Pharaoh's throne, with a crown upon his head, representing the Priesthood as emblematical of the presidency in heaven; with the sceptre of justice and judgment in his hand. He could state no more clearly that the illustration is a judgment scene before the divine throne. That Pharaoh stands behind

the throne may be explained on the very ground the Prophet gives—"courtesy"—for Pharaoh, being himself a priest as well as king, in this way may have recognized the higher priesthood held by Abraham. His part in the tableau was that of an attendant on the divine throne. The entire cast, as explained by the Prophet, is natural. There is the prince representing the exalted personage who leads the man to the throne; a servant representing the man to be judged, and a black slave representing the dark god of the underworld, Anubis. It is strange that the scholars who examined this illustration did not discover how closely they follow, in their interpretation, the explanation offered by the Prophet Joseph.

On the second illustration there is also practical unanimity in regard to its character. It is explained to be a magical disc, a kind of talisman, designed to protect the dead on the other side. But the doctors do not give any interpretation of it. The Prophet explains a small part of it, as representing the structure of the universe, and containing certain "key-words" of the holy Priesthood. The rest he leaves unexplained. Is it wholly improbable that writings intended for the instruction of those who have passed over to the other side should contain representations of the universe over which He reigns before whom they were to appear, or that it should have on it symbolic representations of principles pertaining to the holy Priesthood? On the contrary, that is just what we would expect such a document to contain. Here again scholarship has, though blindfolded and fumbling, added confirmation to the work of the Prophet Joseph.

On the first illustration the scholars, as we have seen, disagree. Some consider it an embalming scene. Others tell us that it is a resurrection scene. We need not waste time over the different explanations, but leave the argument to the scholars themselves. But this is a fact, that of the explanations given, that of the Prophet Joseph is the one which best agrees with the

figures themselves. The figure on the altar cannot represent a corpse, for his attitude is that of a living being. He cannot represent the God Osiris, for there are none of the usual marks by which this divinity is recognized in the Egyptian pictures. The picture can represent an attempt to sacrifice Abraham in the land of Ur, and the appearance of the angel of the Lord, in answer to prayer, to prevent the inhuman rite. The scholars have failed to offer any better explanation.

THE BOOK OF THE DEAD.

But can Abraham have had anything to do with Egyptian documents found in a tomb? The scholars tell us that the illustrations are part of the Book of the Dead, and that, they seem to think, excludes Abraham from further consideration.

What is then the Book of the Dead? It is a collection of manuscripts found with mummies. Some of them are very ancient. They are thought to contain writings of a magical character, though hymns are also found in the text. A collection of 165 sections, or chapters, were made at one time. All the manuscripts discovered are said to be very corrupt, and most of them can only be translated by tracing them further back. In this respect the manuscripts that fell into the hands of the Prophet are not different from others. According to this Book the dead are taken before the judgment seat of Osiris and 42 judges. Their hearts are weighed by Anubis and Thout, and according to this test their fate is decided.

Very little is known about this Book of the Dead, and nothing whatever of its origin. It was the literary growth of centuries, like our Bible, and undoubtedly many authors contributed to it. It may have begun in oral tradition. Choice sentences were at first written down on temple walls, and other suitable places. Later they were copied on papyrus and other material. There is, therefore, nothing unreasonable in the supposition that Abraham may have contributed to it, and that some part of his literary composition

should finally find its way to this country, and to Nauvoo. This, we say, is not unreasonable, and it cannot be successfully denied.

OSIRIS LEGEND.

The Osiris legend may be briefly told here. According to the Egyptians, Osiris was the son of the Earth and the Sky, and married to his sister Isis. He came to Egypt, where he found an uncivilized people whom he raised from barbarism to a state of civilization, by teaching them to till the ground and to worship God. He traveled far and wide. Finally he was slain by treachery. His body was thrown into the river Nile and carried out to sea. Isis, after a long search found it and would have it interred. But while she was visiting her son Horus, the wicked Set, who had caused the murder, tore it to pieces and scattered it all over the Earth. Isis now went in search of the scattered pieces and wherever she found a fragment she buried it, and the spot became sacred ground. Osiris lived in the world beyond, and became the ruler of the dead. The Osiris legend became the basis of the Egyptian doctrine of immortality.

Le Plongeon sees in this myth an Egyptian version of the Bible story of the murder of Abel by his brother Cain. If there is any truth in this conjecture, it would not be a far-fetched conclusion that the Egyptians, probably had heard the story from Abraham himself.

But we would not be surprised to learn some day, on indisputable scientific evidence, that the historical basis of the legend is the narrow escape of Abraham from the idolatrous priests in Ur, and his appearance in Egypt as a standard bearer of civilization and religion. Abraham, like Osiris, came from a far-off land, beyond the point where the Earth and Sky meet, and he, too, was married to his sister (half sister). If it should be to Jacob and to one branch of the descendants of Abraham, is identical with "Osiris," the close connection of Abraham with the Osiris

myth and the Egyptian doctrine of immortality would be established. On this point we quote from "Egypt and Israel," by Mr. Willis Brewer:

"But this view might suggest that I-Sera-El was Asare-El or 'Osiris' himself; and the statement that the bones of Joseph were brought out of Egypt by Bene Ishera-El [the sons of Israel] and buried at Shechem tends to support the Osiris opinion, for Joseph is made son of I-Sera-El. . . . Besides, Sar means 'prince' both in Egyptian and Hebrew, and Osiris had the name Sar, while the God Raa declares himself Sar-son-of-a-Sar. And the tablets found lately at Tel Amarnah, between Memphis and Thebes, prove that the Egyptians were in possession of Palestine at the time, or shortly after, the Bene I-Sera-El are supposed to have gone there from Mi-Zera-im (Egypt), and of course diffused both their language and religion."

The author quoted has some rather fantastic notions and theories, but on etymology he seems to be perfectly sound, and the opinion he advances on the identity of the names Israel and Osiris deserves attention.

WHENCE THIS KNOWLEDGE?

The Book of Abraham must not be judged, however, from the illustrations under consideration alone, but from its marvelous contents. Dr. John A. Widtsoe, in his excellent little book, "Joseph Smith as Scientist," points out that the Prophet clearly understood that the stars form groups, or clusters, which revolve round some one point or powerful star, and that in this he anticipated the scientific world many years. He found this great truth in the Book of Abraham. Can a book which reveals such a truth in advance of science be a fraud?

Another point. In the Book of Abraham the relations between Chaldea and Egypt are so intimate that Dr. John Peters says the interpretation of the plates "displays an amusing ignorance. Chaldeans and Egyptians are hopelessly mixed together, although as dissimilar and remote in language, religion and locality as are today the American and Chinese."

Before the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets this remark might

have been excusable, but now it is astounding. At Tel-el-Amarna a number of letters were found, many of them dating back 1300 years before our era. And this correspondence was carried on, not in the Egyptian hieroglyphics, but in the Babylonian cuneiform letters. It would be interesting to have the learned doctor's opinion as to whether the Chinese had learned American, or the American Chinese.

At all events, some of these letters passed between the courts of Egypt and Babylonia. They show that the Egyptian king, Aken-Aten, had married a sister of the Babylonian king, and that his mother and grandmother were of the Babylonian royal house. They also show that a daughter of the Egyptian king had been sent to Babylonia to become the wife of the king there. They show that the Egyptian king asked for a daughter of the Babylonian monarch, for wife, in addition to the sister, and that his Babylonian majesty diplomatically refused on the ground that he did not know how his sister liked Egypt, or what treatment she had received, whereupon the Egyptian king asked him to send a trusted representative to investigate and report. All this looks like a "hopeless mixture" between

Babylonia and Egypt, but it is historical.

The fact is that even scientists did hardly realize the close relations between the great empires of the ancient world, until these old documents were recovered. But the Book of Abraham indicates these relations. But that is, we are told, "amusing." The Tel el-Amarna letters are still more "amusing," but we cannot reject them on that account.

Bishop Spalding's effort is not new to Latter-day Saints who have followed the history of the Church. His argument is one that has been heard before, without disturbing in the least the faith that rests on solid foundations. It has been fairly and squarely met in the past, and will be answered again, whenever occasion requires, with increasing clearness as the researches continue to reveal further data.

The Latter-day Saints court inquiry, such as this. They want to know the truth, and only the truth. There is no important issue they are not glad to face, whether presented by friend or foe. Their religion has stood every test to which it has been submitted, and it will remain unshaken for ever, because it is founded upon the Rock, and its origin is the Source of all Truth.

The Spalding Argument

BY DR. FREDERICK J. PACK, DESERET PROFESSOR OF GEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

[This article appeared in the *Deseret News*, Dec. 21, 1912, and is reproduced in the ERA by permission of the author.—THE EDITORS.]

An article bearing the title "Joseph Smith, Jr., as a Translator," written by Dr. F. S. Spalding, bishop in Utah of the Episcopal church, has recently received a limited circulation among the Latter-day Saints. The manifest fairness of the inquiry and the apparently well founded conclusions came as some-

what of a surprise to the "Mormon" people. The Latter-day Saints are accustomed to criticism of a malicious and rancorous sort. Fairness and breadth have rarely characterized the investigations of the past. And consequently the apparent fairness shown by Dr. Spalding made far into the ranks